IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.4955 OF 1992
ALONGWITH
WRIT PETITION NO.4956 OF 1992
ALONGWITH
WRIT PETITION NO.4957 OF 1992
ALONGWITH
WRIT PETITION NO.4958 OF 1992
ALONGWITH
WRIT PETITION NO.4959 OF 1992
ALONGWITH
WRIT PETITION NO.4960 OF 1992

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of coram, appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders.	Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr.R.V.More for the petitioners.

CORAM: D.B.BHOSALE, J.

DATED: 2ND SEPTEMBER, 2005.

P.C.:

. In this group of writ petitions though the petitioners and respondents are different they all challenge the orders passed by the Assistant Registrar under section 9 of the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 (for short "the Act") by which the respondents-societies came to be registered sometime in 1991. The orders passed by the Assistant Registrar registering all the societies were carried in appeal in which the registration of the respondent-societies

have been confirmed. There is no dispute that all the respondent-societies are functioning since their registration till this date. Mr.More, learned counsel for the petitioners assailed the impugned orders only on two grounds. Firstly, the respondent-societies were not collecting 400 litres of milk which was a basic requirement under Government Resolution dated 1.12.1990 and secondly, the registration was granted without hearing the petitioners. The Joint Registrar has filed reply affidavit in all the petitions stating that the notices were issued to all concerned parties and they were heard by respondent no.1 before registering the questioned societies. The affidavit furthers states that respondent no.1 while passing the order had taken into consideration the material produced by the respective parties and after considering the feasibility of the said village and the Government guidelines and norms the impugned registration was granted. It is clear from the impugned orders and

the reply affidavit that the proposals of the respondents-societies were examined by respondent no.1 and after detail scrutiny was made of the documents submitted by the respondents-societies they were registered under section 9 of the Act and while doing so all the concerned were heard. I find absolutely no reason to interfere with the impugned orders at this stage. Moreover, it is now well settled that while exercising supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution the High Court is not expected to convert itself into the Court of appeal and indulge in reappreciation or evaluation of evidence or correct errors in drawing inference or correct errors of more formal or technical character. The Supervisory jurisdiction is normally exercised in the cases where the error is manifest and apparent on the face of the proceedings such as when it is passed on clear ignorance or utter disregard of the provisions of law and grave injustice or gross failure of justice

has occassioned thereby. No such error resulting into grave injustice or gross failure of justice was pointed in the orders impugned by the petitioners. This court though had admitted all the petitions in January 1993, the interim order was specifically refused which shows that all these years the respondents-societies are functioning. Keeping that in view and considering the extremely limited jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India I find absolutely no reason to interfere with the concurrent findings recorded by the authorities below. The writ petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.

(D.B.Bhosale, J.)